

CANADA

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/650,708 08/29/2003 Lynn P. Tessier 2012.356 7698 27522 7590 06/16/2005 **EXAMINER** SEAN W. GOODWIN THOMPSON, KENNETH L 237- 8TH AVE. S.E., SUITE 360 PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT THE BURNS BUILDING CALGARY, AB T2G 5C3 3672

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	y
Office Action Summary		10/650,708	TESSIER ET AL.	·
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Kenneth Thompson	3672	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address -	
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuture to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON I, by statute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communical BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	tion.
Status				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on		
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the apparatus of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.		
Applicat	ion Papers		•	•
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the EThe drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2003 Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to be	3 is/are: a) \square accepted or b) \square ob on to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar he correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)		ocuments have been received. Ocuments have been received in A the priority documents have been all Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	·
Attachmer	nt(s)			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT er No(s)/Mail Date		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Art Unit: 3672

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-17 of copending Application No. 10/651,609. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: Claims of the instant application are structurally identical to the copending application.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other

Art Unit: 3672

copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 objected to because of the following informalities: The recitation "is" in line 2 should be changed to "are". Appropriate correction is required.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-17 would be allowable if the double patenting rejection set forth in this Office action is overcome.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest all the claimed subject matter including a bearing assembly positioned downhole of the PC Pump and spaced from the stator, a shaft connected to the rotor and bearings for rotatably supporting and axially restraining the rotor to the bearing assembly so that as the PC Pump rotor rotated to pump liquid through the stator from above the packer to the formation below the packer, uphole loads acting on the rotor are restrained through the bearing assembly.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest all the claimed subject matter including rotating the rotor for pumping liquids from uphole of the packer downhole through the PC Pump and into the lower formation, and supporting the rotor with a bearing assembly positioned downhole of the PC Pump and spaced from the stator.

Art Unit: 3672

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Michael et al., U.S 6,886,636 and Kennedy et al., U.S. 5,730,871 disclose a similar method.

Hill, U.S. 2,739,650 discloses a similar uphole bearing assembly.

Tetzlaff et al., U.S. 5,988,992; Barrus et al., U.S. 5,501,580 and Eppink, U.S. 4,676,725 disclose a similar downhole apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Thompson whose telephone number is 571 272-7037. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David J. Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10 June 2005

KT